

United States Department of the Interior  
Office of Surface Mining  
Mine Site Evaluation Inspection Report

For Office Use Only

1a. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐  
Y Y M M

1b. ☐ ☐  
Batch

1c. ☐ ☐  
Report

## 2. Name of Permittee

## 3. Street Address

## 4. City

## 5. State

## 6. Zip Code

## 7. Area Code

## 8. Telephone Number

## 9. MSHA Number

10. Date of Inspection  
(Y Y M M D D)

## 11. State Permit Number

## 12. Name of Mine

## 13. County Code

## 14. State Code

## 15. Strata

## 16. State Area Office

17. OSM Field  
Office No.
18. OSM Area  
Office No.
19. OSM  
Sample No.
20. Type of Inspection  
(Code)
21. Joint Inspection  
Yes No
22. Inspector's ID  
No.

## 23. Status

A ☐

Type of Permit

B ☐

Mine Status (Code)

C ☐

Type of Facility (Code)

D ☐

Number of Permitted Acres

E ☐

Number of Disturbed Acres

## 24. Type of Activity (check applicable boxes).

A ☐ Steep SlopeE ☐ AnthraciteB ☐ Mountain Top RemovalF ☐ Federal LandsC ☐ Prime FarmlandsG ☐ Indian LandsD ☐ Alluvial Valley FloorsH ☐ Other

## 25. Performance Standards (Codes)

Instructions: Indicate compliance code. For any standard marked 2 or 3 provide narrative to support this determination.

## Standards That Limit the Effects to the Permit Area

- A ☐ Distance Prohibitions  
B ☒ Mining Within Permit Boundaries  
C ☐ Signs and Markers  
D ☐ Sediment Control Measures  
E ☐ Design and Certification Requirements—  
Sediment Control  
F ☐ Effluent Limits  
G ☐ Surface Water Monitoring  
H ☐ Ground Water Monitoring  
I ☐ Blasting Procedures  
J ☒ Haul/Access Road Design and Maintenance  
K ☐ Refuse Impoundments  
L ☐ Other: Specify \_\_\_\_\_

## Standards That Assure Reclamation Quality and Timeliness

- M ☐ Topsoil Handling  
N ☐ Backfilling and Grading  
O ☐ Following Reclamation Schedule  
P ☐ Revegetation Requirements  
Q ☐ Disposal of Excess Spoil  
R ☐ Handling of Acid or Toxic Materials  
S ☐ Highwall Elimination  
T ☐ Downslope Spoil Disposal  
U ☐ Post Mining Land Use  
V ☐ Cessation of Operations: Temporary  
W ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

United States Department of the Interior  
Office of Surface Mining  
Mine Site Evaluation Inspection Report

26. State Permit Number

                    
27. Date of Inspection  
(Y Y M M D D)
     

28. Yes ☐ No ☐ Do mining and reclamation activities on the site comply with the plans in the permit?  
☐ If no, provide narrative to support this determination.

29. Indicate number of complete and partial inspections conducted by the State to date for this annual review period:

29a.   Number of Completes29b.   Number of Partials

30. Indicate number of complete and partial inspections required by the State during this annual review period:

30a.   Number of Completes30b.   Number of Partials

31. Has inspection frequency been met?

Yes ☐ No ☐31a. ☐ ☐ CompletesYes ☐ No ☐31b. ☐ ☐ Partials

32. FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION. [Enter violation number. Check appropriate box(es)]

Ten-Day Notice No.

Notice of Violation No.

Cessation Order No.

Violation Codes

               
               
               
A ☐☐☐

Authorizations to Operate

B ☐☐☐

Signs and Markers

C ☐☐☐

Backfilling and Grading

D ☐☐☐

Highwall Elimination

E ☐☐☐

Rills and Gullies

F ☐☐☐

Improper Fills

G ☐☐☐

Topsoil Handling

H ☐☐☐

Sediment Ponds

I ☐☐☐

Effluent Limits

J ☐☐☐

Water Monitoring

K ☐☐☐

Buffer Zones

L ☐☐☐

Roads

M ☐☐☐

Dams

N ☐☐☐

Blasting

O ☐☐☐

Revegetation

P ☐☐☐

Spoil on the Downslope

Q ☐☐☐

Mining Without Permit

R ☐☐☐

Exceeding Permit Limits

S ☐☐☐

Distance Prohibitions

T ☐☐☐

Toxic Materials

U ☐☐☐

Other Violations

33. Name of Authorized Representative (print or type)

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

Signature of Reviewing Official

Date

04 0

Beaver Creek Coal Company  
P.O. Box 1378  
Price, Utah 84501

Huntington Canyon #4  
Utah Permit #015/004

Oversight Inspection  
March 9, 1988

Participants:

Rade Orell, Office of Surface Mining Albuquerque Field Office (AFO);  
Bill Malencik, Daron Haddock, Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining  
(UDOGM); and Dan Guy, Beaver Creek Coal Company.

Mine Site Evaluation Inspection Report:

This was an oversight inspection therefore the Mine Site Evaluation Inspection Report Form has been completed accordingly. The number 3 has been entered at Performance Standard Codes I, K, and Q to indicate their non-applicability to the mine.

Introduction:

The inspection commenced at the Beaver Creek Coal Company Office where we met the company representative before traveling to the mine site. The weather was clear and mild. The north facing slopes and the access road to the mine site were snow covered at the time of the inspection. Ground conditions were wet and muddy. The inspection also included a records review. A Pentax IQ Zoom was used to photograph areas of interest.

Field Inspection:

The field inspection commenced late in the morning. The permit area and hence the mine site are accessed via a forest service road. We found that the road was not passable to vehicular traffic at the time of the inspection due to snow cover (approximately 6 to 8 inches packed snow), therefore we were required to walk in order to complete the inspection.

Access Road:

The mine site is accessed via a U.S. Forest Service road that adjoins

State Highway 31. The mine site is approximately one mile west of the state highway. The U.S. Forest Service road was upgraded at the time of mining to serve as a haul road. The use of the road by Beaver Creek Coal Company was apparently approved through a special-use permit from the U.S. Forest Service. The company reclaimed the outside portion of the road in accordance with the special-use permit. The road is not within the permit area and the special-use permit is no longer valid. As a result access to the site is often restricted by the U.S. Forest Service when travel due to wet conditions would cause damage to the road.

#### Sediment Pond:

The sediment pond consists of two cells, the lower cell includes a filter. The pond and its appurent structures were found to be intact and functional at the time of the inspection. A topsoil stockpile is located to the west of the pond. The stockpile was found to be in good repair. Silt fences define the stockpile on both the upper and lower slope.

#### Upper Bench:

We walked the U.S. Forest Service access road to the upper bench switch-back. There is a minor erosion channel on the road bank just west of the sediment pond at a point immediately below the topsoil stockpile area. The operator's representative was advised to repair the channel such that the performance standards at UMC 817 (performance standards) are not rendered ineffective thus requiring an enforcement action on the part of UDOGM. At that point we continued to the upper bench switch-back where we departed the road for the purpose of inspecting the reclaimed bench. Generally, the bench is in good repair. We observed a number of small bare areas where revegetation efforts were marginally successful. The operator's representative was advised to perform remedial seeding as the favorable time for seeding approaches. We also observed an area of thistle infestation. The weed was apparently introduced to the area as a result of a recent adjacent AML project. The operator's representative indicated the company's intent to eradicate the weeds as soon as ground conditions permit.

#### Lower Bench:

Following our inspection of the upper bench we descended the area to the lower bench. The inspection continued at an area immediately above the sediment pond. We found that this area is also in need of some remedial work. The operator previously installed a small rock lined channel and a length of silt fence apparently towards controlling erosion. While the structures may be providing a certain level of control additional work will be necessary. We observed numerous small rills that if left unchecked may result in violations of the performance standards. The operator's representative was

advised of the situation. The inspection continued at the area referred to as the coal chute. A rock lined channel was installed here in an endeavor to provide a measure of runoff control. The rock is apparently effective in reducing the rate of runoff through the channel in that silt is accumulating in the channel bottom. The rocks at the upstream end of the channel are not visible due to deposits of silt. We observed an area immediately above the rock channel where the operator will need to perform additional work with respect to manipulation of the land surface. It appeared that the area was previously improperly contour furrowed. The furrows are too low on the slope thereby causing a nick point where runoff exits the slope. In addition, it appears that revegetation efforts have not been adequate. Coal fines mixed with the soil materials may be having detrimental effects on the efforts. We also advised the operator of the situation and the need for remedial work.

#### Records Review:

The records review included observations of the water monitoring records, pond inspection reports, pond certifications, NPDES permit, Annual Subsidence Survey, 1987 Vegetation Survey, Certificate of Liability and confirmation of responses to the permit stipulations. We also reviewed mining and reclamation plan information that indicates that Beaver Creek Coal Company ceased mining operations at the Huntington Canyon #4 Mine in November 1984, reclamation commenced August 1985 and that 60% (Phase I) of the bond was released November 10, 1986.

#### Close-Out:

The close-out meeting was basically a review of the inspection. The UDOGM representative reiterated the areas of concern as described above. We also discussed the remedial work in relation to the nature of the operation. More specifically, the access to the site is limited during the winter months due to snow and wet conditions, and the mine area is in reclamation having gone through Phase I bond release. In that regard it is not unreasonable to expect that remedial work will be necessary following the winter months and wet ground conditions. This narrative references a number of instances where our observations indicated the need for remedial work. That work is not beyond what should reasonably be expected given the nature of the operation. If the described situations continue without attention on the part of the operator the result may be that violations of the performance standards will exist for which UDOGM will be required to take enforcement actions.